



CITY OF
GRAND RAPIDS
IT'S IN MINNESOTA'S NATURE

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, December 05, 2024
4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Pursuant to due notice and call thereof a Regular Meeting of the Grand Rapids Planning Commission will be held on Thursday, December 5, 2024 at 4:00 PM in City Hall Council Chambers, 420 North Pokegama Avenue, Grand Rapids, Minnesota.

CALL OF ROLL:

PRESENT

Commissioner Betsy Johnson
Commissioner Patrick Goggin
Commissioner Paul Bignall
Commissioner Amanda Lamppa
Commissioner David Kreitzer

ABSENT

Commissioner David Marquardt

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Consider approval of the September 5, 2024 regular meeting minutes.

Motion by Commissioner Lamppa, second by Commissioner Bignall to approve the minutes from the September 5, 2024 regular meeting. The following voted in favor thereof: Kreitzer, Lamppa, Goggin, Johnson, Bignall. Opposed: None, motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

2. Conduct a Public Hearing to consider a variance petition submitted by Jacob Stauffer, Overland Group (DGOG).

DGOG submitted a request for a variance, if approved would allow for an area of proposed parking within the 10' front yard setback along the north side of the property. Staff provided a power point presentation.

Correspondence was received from Chad Haatvedt, 802 Willow Lane. Assistant Community Development Director Swenson read the email for the record.

Motion by Commissioner Bignall, second by Commissioner Johnson to open the public hearing. The following voted in favor thereof: Bignall, Johnson, Goggin, Lamppa, Kreitzer. Opposed: None, motion passed unanimously.

There was no public comment.

Motion by Commissioner Johnson, second by Commissioner Lamppa to close the public hearing. The following voted in favor thereof: Kreitzer, Lamppa, Goggin, Johnson, Bignall. Opposed: None, motion passed unanimously.

The Commissioners reviewed the considerations for the record..

1. Is this an “Area” variance rather than a “Use” variance?

This is an area variance.

2. Does the proposal put property to use in a reasonable manner?

Why/Why not- Yes, the former use was retail and the proposed use is retail.

3. Is the owner’s plight due to circumstances which are unique to the property and which are not self-created by the owner?

Why/Why not- Yes, the circumstances were already existing and not created by the owner.

4. Is the variance in harmony with the purposes and intent of the ordinance?

Why/Why not- Yes, it is allowing for redevelopment of an existing commercial property.

5. Will the variance, if granted, alter the essential character of the locality?

Why/Why not- No, the former use is the same as the proposed use.

6. Is the variance consistent with the comprehensive plan?

Why/Why not- Yes, it will allow for redevelopment of an existing commercial site.

Motion by Commissioner Bignall, second by Commissioner Johnson that, based on the findings of fact presented here today, and in the public’s best interest, the Planning Commission does hereby grant the following variance to DGOG Properties for the property legally described within the presentation.

- to allow a variance of the requirements of Section 30-512 Table 2-C of the Municipal Code, which lists Minimum Setbacks for surface parking. This variance permits an area of parking within the 10’ front yard setback along the north side of the property.

The following voted in favor thereof: Bignall, Johnson, Goggin, Lamppa, Kreitzer. Opposed: None, motion passed unanimously.

GENERAL BUSINESS:

3. Consider a recommendation to the City Council regarding a vacation of platted street right-of-way (NE 2nd Ave).

At their September 5th, 2024 meeting the Planning Commission initiated a vacation request for that part of Simpson Avenue (Second Ave NE), Grand Rapids First Division, Blocks 27 and 28 of said plat and northerly of parcel 21 as depicted on the Minnesota Department of Transportation's ROW Plat No. 31-136. This road no longer has a through outlet and is used for County government operations. If vacated the parking area and snow removal would be

managed by the County. Assistant Community Development Director Swenson provided a power point presentation.

The Commissioners reviewed the considerations for the record.

1. Is the right-of-way needed for traffic purposes?

Why/Why not? No, it is closed and no longer used for traffic purposes.

2. Is the right-of-way needed for pedestrian purposes?

Why/Why not? No, there are other pedestrian routes.

3. Is the right-of-way needed for utility purposes?

Why/Why not? A utility easement will be retained.

4. Would vacating the right-of-way place additional land on the tax rolls?

Why/Why not? There will be no additional land on the tax rolls.

5. Would vacating the right-of-way facilitate economic development in the

City? Why/Why not? It will relieve the burden of snow removal and maintenance.

Motion by Commissioner Lamppa, second by Commissioner Johnson, to forward a recommendation to approve the vacation request of the described platted right-of-way described below:

That part of Simpson Avenue (Second Avenue NE), according to the plat of Grand Rapids First Division, on file and of record in the Office of the Itasca County Recorder, that lies between Blocks 27 and 28 of said plat and northerly of parcel 21 as depicted on the Minnesota Department of Transportation's R.O.W. Plat No. 31-136.

The following voted in favor thereof: Bignall, Johnson, Goggin, Lamppa, Kreitzer. Opposed: None, motion passed unanimously.

4. Consider a recommendation to the City Council regarding a vacation of platted street right-of-way (part of NE Third Street).

Eclipse Building Partners have submitted a vacation request if granted would allow for code accessibility improvements to be made to the building located at 12 NW 3rd Street. A power point presentation was provided.

The Commissioners reviewed the considerations for the record.

1. Is the right-of-way needed for traffic purposes?

Why/Why not? No, there is no traffic.

2. Is the right-of-way needed for pedestrian purposes?

Why/Why not? There will still be adequate space for pedestrians.

3. Is the right-of-way needed for utility purposes?

Why/Why not? A utility easement will be retained.

4. Would vacating the right-of-way place additional land on the tax rolls?
Why/Why not? Yes, it will.

5. Would vacating the right-of-way facilitate economic development in the City? Why/Why not? Yes, it will allow for the opening of a new business.

Motion by Commissioner Johnson, second by Commissioner Bignall, to forward a recommendation to approve the vacation request of the described platted right-of-way described below:

A part of Third Street as dedicated on the plat of the TOWN OF GRAND RAPIDS MINNESOTA, lying adjacent to and abutting Lot 12, Block 18, GRAND RAPIDS

The following voted in favor thereof: Kreitzer, Lamppa, Goggin, Johnson, Bignall. Opposed: None, motion passed unanimously.

5. Consider a recommendation to the City Council regarding a vacation of platted right-of-way (Block 19).

The requested variance is needed to build an adequate kitchen for a restaurant. Staff provided a power point presentation.

The Commissioners reviewed the considerations for the record.

1. Is the right-of-way needed for traffic purposes?
Why/Why not? No, there is still enough room for traffic.

2. Is the right-of-way needed for pedestrian purposes?
Why/Why not? No, there is adequate space for pedestrians.

3. Is the right-of-way needed for utility purposes?
Why/Why not? A utility easement will be retained.

4. Would vacating the right-of-way place additional land on the tax rolls?
Why/Why not? Yes, it will place additional land on the tax rolls.

5. Would vacating the right-of-way facilitate economic development in the City? Why/Why not? Yes, it will allow for a new business which will provide another dining option in the downtown.

Motion by Commissioner Lamppa, second by Commissioner Johnson, to forward a recommendation to approve the vacation request of the described platted right-of-way described below:

The West 2 feet of the N/S alley lying adjacent to the east line of the following tract: The East

34.5 feet of Lots Thirteen (13) and Fourteen (14), and the East 34.5 feet of the North 6 feet of Lot Fifteen (15), Block Nineteen (19), Town of Grand Rapids

With the following recommendation:

Retain a utility easement.

The following voted in favor thereof: Bignall, Johnson, Goggin, Lamppa, Kreitzer. Opposed: None, motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Individuals may address the Planning Commission about any non-public hearing item or any item not included on the Regular Meeting Agenda. Speakers are requested to come to the podium, state their name and address for the record and limit their remarks to three (3) minutes.

MISCELLANEOUS:

REPORTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS/UPDATES:

Director of Community Development Mattei provided an update on the development of a 64 unit apartment building down by the river and 132 unit apartment building in the Great River Acres development.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR JANUARY 2, 2025 AT 4:00 PM.

Hearing Assistance Available: This facility is equipped with a ready assistance system.

ATTEST:

Aurimy Groom, Administrative Assistant